

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|
| SEAGEN INC., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | CASE NO. 2:20-cv-00337-JRG |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| DAIICHI SANKYO CO., LTD., |) | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED |
| |) | |
| Defendant, |) | |
| |) | |
| ASTRAZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS LP, AND ASTRAZENECA UK LTD., |) | |
| |) | |
| Intervenor-Defendants. |) | |

JOINT AGREED MOTIONS *IN LIMINE*

Plaintiff Seagen Inc. (“Seagen”) and Defendants Daiichi Sankyo Company, Limited, AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and AstraZeneca UK Ltd. (collectively, “Defendants”) jointly move the Court to enter the following additional motions *in limine* that the parties agreed to after further meet and confer:

1. Preclude evidence and argument bolstering or disparaging the U.S. Patent Office, its examiners, or the process for prosecuting patent applications or granting patents in the United States. This does not preclude evidence and argument consistent with the Federal Judiciary Center patent video played to the jury or regarding the facts in the prosecution history of the '039 patent or patent family. (Seagen’s Motion *in Limine* No. 5 (Dkt. 314 at 6-7); Defendants’ Motion *in Limine* No. 16 (Dkt. 319 at 15))
2. Preclude argument or reference to any pre-trial disputes or rulings over discovery, alleged failure or refusal to provide requested discovery, or any witness or party’s discovery conduct without prior approval from the Court. (Defendants’ Motion *in Limine* No. 11 (Dkt. 319 at 13))
3. Preclude argument or reference to pre-trial disputes over venue, including any motion to transfer or dismiss venue in the Eastern District of Texas on the part of Defendants and any judicial ruling regarding venue. This does not preclude testimony, evidence, or argument as to the underlying facts regarding venue or personal jurisdiction. (Defendants’ Motion *in Limine* No. 15 (Dkt. 319 at 15))

This joint motion, when granted, will resolve Seagen's Motion *in Limine* 5, and Defendants' Motions *in Limine* 11, 15, and 16.

Dated: February 21, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Matthew A. Chivvis

Michael A. Jacobs
MJacobs@mofo.com
Matthew A. Chivvis
MChivvis@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER
LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: 415.268.7000
Facsimile: 415.268.7522

Bryan Wilson
BWilson@mofo.com
Pieter S. de Ganon
PdeGanon@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
Telephone: 650.813.5600
Facsimile: 650.494.0792

Melissa R. Smith
Texas State Bar No. 24001351
melissa@gillamsmithlaw.com
GILLAM & SMITH, LLP
303 South Washington Avenue
Marshall, Texas 75670
Telephone: 903.934.8450
Facsimile: 903.934.9257

Of Counsel:

T. John Ward, Jr.
Texas State Bar No. 00794818
jw@wsfirm.com
Charles Everingham IV
Texas State Bar No. 00787447
ce@wsfirm.com
Andrea L. Fair
Texas State Bar No. 24078488
andrea@wsfirm.com
WARD, SMITH & HILL, PLLC
1507 Bill Owens Parkway

By: /s/ Deron R. Dacus

Deron R. Dacus
Texas State Bar No. 00790553
ddacus@dacusfirm.com
THE DACUS FIRM, P.C.
821 ESE Loop 323, Suite 430
Tyler, Texas 75701
Telephone: 903.705.1117
Facsimile: 903.581.2543

J. Mark Mann
Texas State Bar No. 12926150
mark@themannfirm.com
G. Blake Thompson
Texas State Bar No. 240420033
blake@themannfirm.com
MANN | TINDEL | THOMPSON
201 E. Howard Street
Henderson, Texas
Telephone: 903.357.8540
Facsimile: 903.657.6003

*Attorneys for Defendant Daiichi Sankyo
Company, Limited*

OF COUNSEL:

Preston K. Ratliff II
Ashley N. Mays-Williams
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166
Telephone: 212.318.6000

Jeffrey A. Pade
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
2050 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202.551.1700

*Attorneys for Defendant Daiichi Sankyo
Company, Limited*

Longview, Texas 75604
Telephone: 903.757.6400
Facsimile: 903.757.2323

Attorneys for Plaintiff Seagen Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served this 21st day of February 2022, with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

/s/ Melissa R. Smith

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I hereby certify that counsel for Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants have complied with the meet and confer requirement in Local Rule CV-7(h) regarding this Motion on February 21, 2022. The Parties are in agreement and are seeking joint relief.

/s/ Melissa R. Smith